

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,795	04/23/2001	Erin E. Murphy	SF0818KQ	5250
28008	7590 11/25/2005		EXAMINER	
DNAX RESEARCH, INC.			O HARA, EILEEN B	
LEGAL DEP	,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
901 CALIFORNIA AVENUE			AKTONII	PAPER NOMBER
PALO ALTO, CA 94304			1646	

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/840,795	MURPHY ET AL.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	<u> </u>		
	Eileen O'Hara	1646			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 23 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notation (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of</li> </ol>	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	f Appeal. To avoid at ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th		er is later. In no		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)		
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compositing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any elements a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be a Notice of Appeal has been filed.</li> </ol>	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	, to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.		
AMENDMENTS		<b></b>			
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in belonger.	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);			
appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a			the issues for		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		•			
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s</li> </ul>		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	ent canceling		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ w vided below or appended.	ill be entered and an	explanation of		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>11-15 and 21-23</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>r</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.			nce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  13. Other:					
	•				

Art Unit: 1646

The claims remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, for reasons of record in the previous office actions. Applicants assert that the stated utility of modulating apoptosis is a specific and substantial utility, which is supported by Sinha et al., and the fact that other TNF receptors also have this activity only further supports the credibility of this utility. In the response, Applicants cite sections of the M.P.E.P. concerning the utility requirement, and assert that the upregulation of RANKL mRNA in at least two models of inflammation is sufficient to support the minimal requirement for utility. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, for reasons of record in the previous office actions. Upregulation of the transcript in two models of lung inflammation does not support a specific and substantial utility – the transcript is not upregulated in other models of lung inflammation. Modulation of apoptosis or regulation of cell proliferation or development are also not specific and substantial utilities absent information regarding what cells would be involved or when. The specification does not disclose in what cells types at what stages of development RANKL would cause apoptosis or modulate cell proliferation or development. Wallach (of record) teaches that the members of the TNF receptor and ligand family have specific expression patterns, can induce or inhibit cell death or sometimes both, and modulate cell growth in specific cells (see especially page 397). Further research would be required to determine how the protein (or antibodies) could be used, and therefore the asserted utilities are not substantial. M.P.E.P. 2107.01 (I) states "A "substantial utility" defines a "real world" use. Utilities that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use are not substantial utilities." For these reasons, the rejections are maintained.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eileen B. O'Hara, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 10:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa can be reached at (571) 272-0829.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

Eileen B. O'Hara, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Clyabet C. Kemmen